

Julia Mitchell

From: Stuart, David [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 May 2018 11:11
To: Martha Covell
Cc: Mark Axford; Ola Wiebe; Harry Seccombe; Neighbourhood Plan
Subject: Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Martha

Many thanks for your email with follow up information. My apologies for not getting back to you before now.

The purpose behind our reference to the underpinning evidence base for the proposed site allocations in the Plan is to ensure that they are in principle suitable for development as envisaged and therefore deliverable. As you know, however stringent from a heritage perspective overarching or complementary policies might be, it is unhelpful if once sites are allocated fundamental difficulties are only found at the post Made/ planning application stage as this creates a lack of certainty and undermines the credibility of the Plan making process and planning system overall. For that reason it is helpful to confirm that the evidence base has appropriately identified and understood the significance of relevant heritage assets and used this information to substantiate the sites and associated policies in question.

Fortunately in this case the limited nature of designated heritage assets in the Plan area reduces the amount of work involved in giving the sites in question a clean bill of health from an allocation point of view. The AECOM report indicates that the heritage significance of those assets identified can be accommodated in the development design process and the robustness of other policies for the protection of the historic environment are, as you suggest, then capable of ensuring that outcome.

On a point of technical detail we feel the need to highlight that the references to heritage assets and the potential for impact upon them within the AECOM report tend towards assertion. In other similar scenarios with a greater presence of heritage assets we have been obliged to indicate that this is not equivalent to evidence and request additional information/clarification to substantiate those conclusions. However, for the reasons explained above, and the fact that in this instance we have a degree of local knowledge ourselves, helpfully that need does not exist in this instance.

Our only other observation concerns future proofing the sites and related policies. The community is keen to extend the regime of conservation areas in the Plan area and if successful there may be potential for this to have implications in some form for the site allocations in question. It might therefore be useful for the Plan making process to reassure itself that these two agendas won't clash at some point in the future.

On this overall basis I can now confirm that we do not identify any heritage issues which might imply that from this perspective we consider a full SEA is required. We would therefore have no objection should Bournemouth Council in its formal Screening Opinion determine that an SEA is not required.

Kind regards

David

David Stuart | Historic Places Adviser South West
[REDACTED]

From: Martha Covell [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 March 2018 12:36
To: Stuart, David
Cc: Mark Axford; Ola Wiebe; Harry Seccombe; Neighbourhood Plan
Subject: Fwd: Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan

David,

I am writing in response to your consultation response to the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan and further to your correspondence with Bournemouth Council, all of which I have now had a chance to review on behalf of the BAP working group.

Please find attached the AECOM report which contains some of the evidence used to allocate sites in Policy BAP10.

As you know heritage is a key theme of the plan as is the need to ensure that developments are built to an appropriate density which reflects the character and appearance of the area. something which is given greater weigh in the draft NPPF (currently out to consultation).

Any planning application which came forward as a result of the allocation of sites under BAP10 would therefore need to comply with other heritage policies in the plan, most notably BAP1 and BAP2. We consider these to be far more stringent in heritage terms than existing Bournemouth Core Strategy policies.

I would also like to draw your attention to the Basic Conditions Statement contained in the appendices of the plan, which sets out how the NP adheres to existing strategic policies.

Perhaps when you have had a chance to review this evidence you will be able to confirm that an SEA is not required.

In the future we intend to progress the site allocations with further discussions with landowners and statutory agencies and would be very happy for Historic England to be involved in these discussions.

Please do get in touch with me directly if you have any further queries.

Martha